



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

bona terra comedetis, et aeterna procul dubio fruemini vita. Sin autem, quod non credimus, et aliquam posueritis moram, aut ad inventionem minime velociter hanc nostram adimplendam adhortationem, ad liberandam hanc meam civitatem Romanam, et populum in ea commorantem, et sanctam Dei apostolicam ecclesiam a Domino mihi commissam, simul et ejus praesullem; scias vos ex auctoritate sanctae et unicæ Trinitatis per gratiam apostolatus, quæ data est mihi a Christo Domino, vos alienari pro transgressione nostre adhortationis a regno Dei, et vita eterna. Sed Deus et Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui nos suo precioso sanguine redimens, ad lucem perduxit veritatis, nos quoque predicatorum et illuminatores totius mundi constituit, det vobis ea sapere et intelligere, eaque disponere nimis velociter; ut celerius hanc civitatem Romanam et ejus populum, seu sanctam Dei Ecclesiam mihi a Deo commissam ad eruendum occurras, quatenus misericorditer, sicut fidelibus sue potentie, meis pro vobis interventibus suffragii, et in presenti vita longevos, sospites, et victores conservare jubeat, et venturo in saeculo dona sue remuneracionis faciat multiplicius promereri cum sanctis et electis suis. Bene Valete."—*Labbe and Coss., Con. Gen. Vol. vi. 1639.*

Correspondence.

TRUE EPISTLES OF ST. PETER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—It is, I think, about two years ago, that in your columns I asked your correspondent, Mr. Rourke, if he would be kind enough to prove to me the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome from the inspired epistles of St. Peter, corroborating his assertions and inferences by references to other parts of the sacred Scriptures. Mr. Rourke intimated that he would comply with this request.

I need hardly say that by "peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome," I mean such as Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, Priestly confession, and Absolution; Celibacy of the Clergy; the articles of belief established by the Council of Trent, embodied in the creed of Pope Pius IV.; and to these I will now add, what has since been promulgated as an article of faith, necessary to be believed for salvation, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of her who is blessed among women, the Virgin Mary, mother of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I am sorry that, not having the CATHOLIC LAYMAN to refer to at present, I cannot give the date of my request, nor of Mr. Rourke's promise; it will, however, I hope, be sufficient to remind him of them, and I trust that he will now undertake what ought, according to his views, to be an easy task, so far as he may find the Word of God for a foundation. Of course, I expect him to confine himself to that, on the apostolic precept, "that other foundation can no man lay."—I am, Sir, yours, &c.

"A."

A WORD ABOUT ORIGEN AND CELSUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—Do you not know that when Origen says "that he offered his prayers to God above all and through Christ," that he said what we Catholics say now? but you won't say that St. Paul was doing wrong when he asked the prayers of his fellow-creatures on earth. In the same way we ask the prayers of the angels and saints, who are in more favour with God than sinners. So did Origen, but the great Origen would not hear of the angels [devils] that Celsus meant.

I am, Sir, your obedient,

W. B.

W. B. here maintains that it was Origen's opinion that although *prayers* ought to be offered to God alone, still we might lawfully ask for the *intercession* of saints and angels. W. B. must have arrived at this conclusion merely because he knows that Origen *ought* to have thought so, if the doctrine of the Church in his time had been the same as that now held in the Church of Rome. But if W. B. had looked either into Origen's works, or into the extracts we gave from them, he would have found that Origen's opinion was very different.

Let W. B. look to the passage cited (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, p. 47), in which Origen is speaking not of devils, but of those angels, souls, and spirits who are friends of God. Origen teaches that if we desire the help or the intercession of such spirits, we must obtain it not by direct calling upon the angels, but by striving to make God our friend by the practice of piety and virtue. As the shadow follows the substance, so when we gain the friendship of God the friendship of his angels will follow, and when we pray to God they will pray with us *without being asked*. Origen tells us also (see p. 75), that it is unreasonable to call upon angels because we possess no knowledge concerning them or concerning the functions which each has to discharge; and that even if we had this knowledge, still it would not warrant us in offering our intercessions as well as our prayers in any way except to God through Christ.

W. B. asks, why should we not ask the intercession of saints and angels, when we may lawfully ask for the prayers of our brethren upon earth? We answer, in the first place, that whether we can explain the *why* or

not, the fact is that the Bible gives us every encouragement to pray for each other and to ask each other's prayers; but it never once, either by precept or example, gives us the smallest encouragement to ask for the prayers of a departed saint or of an angel. And the fact also is, that the primitive fathers, as we have just seen in Origen's case, though they ask for the intercession of their friends on earth, disapprove of asking for the prayers of saints or angels, and don't in their works set us any example of such prayers.

We may answer, in the second place, that we ask for the prayers of friends on earth because we have the means of communicating with them and making our wishes known to them. We do not offer prayers to saints or angels, because we have no knowledge that such petitions can reach the objects to whom they are addressed. It would be as unreasonable to do so as if we were to kneel down and ask living men, who were a thousand miles distant, to pray for us.

Thirdly—When we ask for the prayers of living men there is no danger of idolatry. When St. Paul asked his converts to give him this proof of their love, it was surely not that he thought they were in more favour with God than he was. The mutual prayers of Christians for each other do not turn any aside from direct calling on God, but rather stir them up to more earnest addresses to the Almighty.

It is very different when we ask for the prayers of a saint or an angel, who is supposed to be more in favour with God than we—so much in favour, in short, that his requests to God are *sure* to be heard. If we can secure the intercession of such a being, we have no occasion for direct addresses to God. That invisible Being to whom we come to make known our wants, and who we believe has always the power of relieving them, is, in fact, our God. It does not matter whether he relieves our wants by his own power or by obtaining the help of some higher divinity: if we can come to him always with confidence in his willingness to hear, and in his power to help, we need no other God.

The fact, then, that prayer for the intercession of saints and angels necessarily leads to idolatry sufficiently explains why the Scriptures and the early fathers never recommend or encourage it.

COLUMBANUS ON HOLY WELLS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—You have elicited so many recent testimonies as to the prevalent superstition in Ireland as to holy wells, that, perhaps, you may think the following extracts from Dr. Charles O'Conor's third letter on the Irish Church not unworthy of insertion in your paper.

When alluding to the well of St. Winefrid, in Wales, of which you published an amusing account in your 4th vol., page 110, Dr. O'Conor proceeds thus:

"And now, with regard to S. Winefrid, I solemnly protest that a word of disrespectful language towards the person called S. Winefrid never escaped my lips. I recollect, indeed, that when the Bishop of Castabala (Dr. Milner) published his miraculous pamphlet, on the wonderful cures performed at the well in Flintshire, commonly called S. Winefrid's, I complained to the good bishop of the London district, that false miracles had always been a source of infidelity; that Catholics ought to be particularly cautious how they countenanced superstitious practices; that *well worshipping* was a Druidic superstition; that Doctor Milner was quite ignorant of the pagan practices which yet remain in the mountainous parts of Ireland and Wales, and that he was coming forward, in the 19th century, to canonise Druidism, and mix it up with the doctrines of Christianity."

Doctor Linden, who examined the waters of S. Winefrid's, proves that their medicinal qualities are beyond all dispute; and that their green and sweet scented moss is frequently applied to ulcerated wounds with signal success, which he ascribes very properly to a vegetating spirit in that water, which is clear of all gross earth and mineral contents. He also recommends it as a most powerful cold bath of the first rank; having in its favour a variety of authentic cures, worked upon the most stubborn and malignant diseases, such as leprosy, weakness of nerves, and other chronic inveterate disorders. The salutary effects of cold baths, commonly called *holy wells*, has been abundantly demonstrated to result from natural causes, and more particularly in regard to Holy Well, in Flintshire.^b

"The truth is, that the medicinal qualities of these wells were known to the Druids, who were professed naturalists, as stated by Pliny; and, therefore, that in times of Druidism they were objects of veneration, as well as the oak, the upright unheaved stone, and the missettoe.

"That well-worship was a part of the Pagan system, which prevailed in Ireland before the introduction of Christianity, is clear from *Euvius*, or whoever was the author of the *Vita 7 ma S. Patricii*, which was certainly written before the invasion of Ireland by Henry II. He expressly states that the pagan Irish *adored fountains*

^a Linden, on Chalybeat Waters, Lond. 1748, p. 126.

^b Philon, Trans. n. 57, vol. 5, p. 1160—Bingley's North Wales. The supposed tincture of S. Winefrid's blood is a vegetable production, *Bysus Jolites*.

as *divinities*; and his authority is confirmed beyond all doubt by the evidence of Adamnan, an eye-witness, who wrote half a century before Bede, and mentions another Irish fountain, which the pagans of S. Columba's days adored as *divine*.

"I have often inquired of your tenants, what they themselves thought of their pilgrimages to the wells of Kill-Arach, Tobbar Brighde, Tobbar Muire, near Elphin, Moor, near Castlereagh, where multitudes annually assembled to celebrate what they, in broken English, termed *Patterns* (Patron's days); and when I pressed a very old man, Owen Hester, to state what possible advantage he expected to derive from the singular custom of frequenting in particular such wells as were contiguous to an old *blasted oak*, or an upright *unheaved stone*, and what the meaning was of the yet more singular custom of sticking *rags* on the branches of such trees, and spitting on them, his answer, and the answer of the oldest men, was that their ancestors always did it; that it was a preservative against *Geasa-Draioidecht*, i.e., the sorceries of Druids; that their cattle were preserved by it from infectious disorders; that the *daoiinti maithé*, i.e., the fairies, were kept in good *humour* by it, and so thoroughly persuaded were they of the sanctity of these pagan practices, that they would travel bare-headed and bare footed from ten to twenty miles for the purpose of crawling on their knees round these wells, and *upright stones*, and *oak trees* westward, as the sun travels, some three times, some six, some nine, and so on, in uneven numbers, until their voluntary penances were completely fulfilled. The waters of *Logh-Con* were deemed so sacred from ancient usage, that they would throw into the lake whole rolls of butter, as a preservative for the milk of their cows against *Geasa-Draioideacht*!"

"The same customs existed among the Irish colonies of the Highlands and Western Islands; and even in some parts of the Lowlands of Scotland. 'I have often observed,' says Mr. Brand, 'shreds, or bits of *rags*, upon the bushes that overhang a well in the road to Benton near Newcastle, which is called the *Rag-well*.' Mr. Pennant says, 'They visit the well of *Spye* in Scotland, for many distempers, and the well of *Drachaldy*, for as many, offering small pieces of money and bits of *rags*.'

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
VIATOR.

We feel obliged to *Viator* for recalling our attention to Dr. O'Conor's able work, and shall probably, at an early opportunity, give some further extracts from it, on the origin of *Irish Well-worship*.

COME, CRACK ME THIS NUT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

DEAR SIR,—I am a very little boy, and I am at school, and mamma sent me a nice bag of nuts, and the boys were very bold to me about them, and the master was very hard on me, and I said I would write to tell you, because you like fair play, and you will tell me if it's right; and I am sure you will take my part about the nuts.

I was sitting in the schoolroom with a great many little boys, and I was giving them nuts, and we were all cracking them, and the nuts were very good, and I was helping some of the little boys to crack them, because my teeth were stronger than theirs, and the more there was of us together, the more nuts we cracked; because, when a very hard nut came, if one could not crack it another could, and you never saw little boys so happy, and nobody spoke bad word, but we were all very good, and so were the nuts. But a very hard nut came, and I was crying out, "Come, crack me this nut;" and just at that minute some of the big boys came into the schoolroom, for there are a great many big boys at this school, who only stay at school because they are too silly to learn anything useful; so they stay at school till they are as big as men, and we call them "schoolmen," and not schoolboys. And when the "schoolmen" came they pulled my nuts away from me, and they said cracking nuts was not fit for little boys, and that little boys did not know how to crack them, so they would crack them for us; so a big boy got a stone and he held a nut on my head between his finger and thumb, and then he cracked the nut on my head with the stone, and he eat it himself, and said it was very good; and then all the big boys began to crack the nuts on the little boys' heads, but they only spoiled the nuts, for they mashed the kernels and greased and dirtied them, so that they were not fit to eat, and they cut our heads with the shells; and the little boys got none of the nuts, and the big boys were not a bit the better for them; and three big boys were cracking nuts on my head together, and I wished there never were any nuts at all, though I liked them so much just before, and I cried very much because I was hurt. And then the master came into the school when he heard me crying, and he got very angry, and he said nuts were not fit things for boys to have, because they might hurt themselves trying to open them, and he said he would whip all the little boys for crying; but he did not scold the big boys at all, though he saw the way they were cracking the nuts on our heads. But he took my bag of nuts, and said nobody should crack nuts in the school but himself, because nobody but a schoolmaster knew how to crack nuts; so then all the big boys cried out, like mean creatures, that nobody but a schoolmaster could crack nuts, although the idle fellows never did any-

thing else themselves except cracking nuts. And then the master said the big boys were very good boys, and very sensible boys, and he would give them a pudding for dinner, and none for us. So I said then if he would only tell the big boys not to crack the nuts on my head, but to let me and the little boys crack them quietly and nicely, the way we were doing before, that then there would be no harm done in cracking the nuts. And then he asked me did I dare to know better than the master? And he said nobody could crack nuts, and nobody should crack nuts in that school but him; and he said they were very wholesome, and he would crack them all himself and give them to us. And then he tried some and he said they were blind, and he gave us the shells, but I saw him eating the kernels. And then I said I would like to crack one myself, just to see if it was good, and then he got very angry and said, did I doubt his word? And then he said just the contrary of what he said before, for he said there was a kernel in every one of them when he cracked it, but they would be all blind if we cracked them; and I said I would like to taste a kernel; and then he said, was it not enough for me that he told me there were kernels in them, and that they had a very good taste; and he said that nuts were not fit for little boys, and would disagree with them, and they would hurt themselves with the shells; and he was our schoolmaster and must take care of us, and keep us from hurting ourselves. But he broke the nuts so badly that the boys, big and little, all began to laugh at him; so he got very angry, and he cracked our heads all round, and took away the bag of nuts, and never let any of us get a nut to crack for ourselves since, nor let us see him crack a nut. So I said I would write and tell you, because you love fair play, and I know you will take my part about the nuts.

Your little servant,

TOMMY NUTCRACKER.

We really must take the part of our little friend, who tells his story so nicely about the nuts. We strongly advise his mother to remove him from his present school. The big boys are not fit companions for him. Those who grow up to be men, with the habits and ideas of schoolboys, are not fit companions either for men or for boys. The master is evidently morally unfit for his office. He is not fit either to crack nuts for boys or do anything else for them. Some old people may think it a trifling thing to prevent a schoolboy cracking his own nuts, but we consider it a direct infringement of the natural rights of schoolboys; and, notwithstanding all the master's assertions, we are convinced that schoolboys know how to crack nuts much better than schoolmasters do. We strongly advise Tommy's mamma to remove him to another school.

But we have a word for Tommy, too. We all should learn from our misfortunes and trials, especially schoolboys, whose business it is to learn; indeed, public schools are recommended on this very ground, that the little trials which boys meet at them teach them what to expect in life, and how to meet it. When Tommy gets out into the world he will meet just the same thing over again in respect to more serious matters. He will see that there is a great objection in this world to letting people crack their own nuts quietly. He will meet many mischievous persons who are always delighted to crack other people's nuts on the owners' heads. He will meet others who abuse authority by taking all nutcracking into their own hands.

Tommy will find this in religion, as well as in everything else. There are things in religion which seem hard outside, but the inside is good food if we can open them. In the early times of the Church even children were encouraged to search into these things, and it was thought that they would get good out of them. We have often quoted the greatest of the Fathers to this effect, and have not room to repeat it here. And this continued until a class of men arose who have ever since been called "the schoolmen," perhaps for the same reason that Tommy speaks of. These men professed to be the great exponents of all difficult questions in the Scriptures or in religion, and they contrived to have it thought that none but they could solve these difficulties; yet, if we were to collect specimens of their solutions, which, perhaps, we may do some day, our readers would be astonished to see how puerile their solutions were.

But the worst of it was that they took to cracking their nuts on other people's heads; and many a child of God has been made sore and sorry by their doings. Alas, for the Albigenenses and Waldenses! the "schoolmen" cracked nuts on their heads to a sad purpose.

It is strange how like the doings of boys at school are the doings of grown children. When that great master the Pope proclaimed that he alone could solve questions, it was the "schoolmen"—who spent their lives in nothing else but solving questions—who shouted loudest that none but the pope could solve them.

But Tommy says that once the master undertook to be the only nutcracker, the effect was that the master cracked no more nuts at all. It is very likely, because every one looked at him, and they laughed when he did it badly. Now, we have a parallel for this, too. As long as the bishops of Rome did not profess to be the only persons who could solve questions in religion they wrote many valuable books on Scripture. Thus, Pope Leo the Great, who wished every one to read the Scriptures, wrote very valuable commentaries on Scripture. But when popes once claimed to be the sole exponents of Scripture, then no pope ever

expounded Scripture at all, for fear of exposing himself. We beg our Roman Catholic correspondents to tell us of any exposition of Scripture ever written by a pope since popes claimed to be the sole infallible exponents. If they cannot tell us of any, it seems the claim has worked very badly.

Tommy's letter might suggest many other points of comparison, but we must leave them to the consideration of our readers. We have only room to hope that Tommy may at once be removed from his present school, and that Tommy may have learned this lesson for after life—that there will be less mischief done by cracking his own nuts, and that he should be very slow to join himself to any "school" in which "schoolmen" crack their nuts on other people's heads, or in which the master claims to be the only nutcracker.

Yet, we are very far from inferring that people may not want the help of a standing ministry, to understand the Scriptures. We have a case in the Scripture itself. The Eunuch could not understand the Scriptures, "Except some man should guide him" (Acts, viii., 31). But Philip, the deacon, did not, therefore, tell the Eunuch to shut his book and not to read it, but taught him how to read with understanding; and, as far as we can understand, Philip sent him on his way rejoicing, to read his book more diligently than ever.

We believe that a general reading of the Scriptures, as practised in the early Church, along with a teaching ministry to enable men to read with understanding, is God's institution for the instruction of mankind. And such a reading and such a ministry is the great object of our desires as CATHOLIC LAYMEN. We trust that Tommy, and many others, may learn this lesson for their future life.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Mr. W. Rourke's letters are written in so candid a spirit that I cannot but think he would give a fair and honest consideration to an argument against transubstantiation being the primitive doctrine of the Church, which appears to me so convincing that I can scarcely conceive how a person of his candour and intelligence could resist it.

I would first entreat Mr. Rourke to say, with all candour, whether the following passages from St. Augustine are capable of being understood in the Roman Catholic sense by any truly honest and intelligent mind:

1st. "If the sacraments had not some resemblance of those things whereof they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all; but from this resemblance they take for the most part the names of those things. Therefore, as the *sacrament of the body of Christ* is in some manner (*secundum quendam modum*) the body of Christ, so the sacrament of faith (meaning baptism) is faith."^a

2nd. "If the speech be a precept forbidding some heinous wickedness, or commanding that which is profitable, it is not figurative; but if it seem to command any heinous wickedness, it is figurative. 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.' This seems to command a heinous wickedness, therefore it is a FIGURE, commanding us to communicate of the passion of our Lord, and sweetly and profitably to lay up in our memory that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us."^b

3rd. "When his disciples had remained with Him, the rest having gone back, He instructed them and said to them, 'It is the spirit which giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you they give spirit and they are life.' Understand spiritually what I have spoken: *You shall not eat this body which you see, and drink that blood which they will shed who shall crucify me.*"^c

4th. Accordingly, Augustine taught that the eating was spiritual, and that the ungodly did not eat the body of Christ. "Finally, he explains what it is to eat his body and drink his blood—'He who eateth my flesh abideth in me and I in him.' This, therefore, is to eat that food and drink that drink; to abide in Christ, and to have Him abiding in themselves; and, by this, he who does not abide in Christ, and in whom Christ does not abide, neither eats spiritually his flesh, nor drinks his blood, though carnally and visibly he *pres* with his teeth the *sacrament* of the body and blood of Christ."^d

The passage cited by Mr. R. from Augustine in his letter of June last (C. L. p. 70), "Ferebatur in manibus suis," is thus easily understood of Christ's figurative and sacramental body.

And, if quoted in full, the passage makes rather for the other side. It runs as follows:—"For Christ was carried in his own hands. When commanding his body he said—'This is my body,' for he carried that body (*illud corpus*) in his own hands"—evidently a sacramental body in a figurative and sacramental manner.

Protestants find no difficulty in such language. Christ said that the bread was his body, and we say so too. Tertullian, in the second century, says, "The bread which the Saviour took and distributed to his disciples

^a Epist. 98, to Boniface, Benedict, edit. Paris, 1679, vol. 2, p. 267. F.

^b Vol. 3, pt. 1., p. 52, s. 24, De Doctrina Christiana, lib. 3.

^c Vol. 4, p. 1066, Enarratio in Psalm 98, c. 9

^d Vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 501, s. 18, in John c. 6. Tractat xxvi.

^e Vol. 4, p. 214, Enarr. II, in Psalm 33, s. 10.

He made his own body by saying, 'This is my body—that is, the *image or figure* of my body.' In Kelly's Hymns we find the following stanza:

"See, our Saviour spreads a table,
And invites his friends to eat;
Sure none but he is able
To supply so rich a treat:
'Tis His body.'
Brethren, this indeed is meat."

I would also refer Mr. Rourke to the writings of Chrysostom in the 4th century, who, writing against the Apollinarian doctrine, which taught that the human nature of Christ was swallowed up and destroyed by the Divine, illustrates the permanency of the humanity by the permanency of bread in the consecrated Eucharist. "As before the bread is consecrated we call it bread, but when the Divine grace has consecrated it, it is freed from the name of bread, and is thought worthy of the name of the Lord's body, though the nature of bread has remained in it."^f

Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, in the 5th century, writing against the same heresy, uses the same illustration:—"Our Saviour honoured the visible signs with the name of his body and blood; not changing their nature, but adding grace to nature.—Paris edit., 1642, vol. 4, 17, 18. Again—"Thou art caught in thine own net, for neither do the mystical symbols after consecration pass out of their own nature; for they remain in their former substance, figure, and appearance."—Dial. 2, p. 85.

What I ask for is not counter testimonies; such passages must either be understood of the *Sacramental body*, or can at most only prove that there were individuals who adopted strange and peculiar views upon the subject. The question is—what was the teaching of the primitive Church? and this can be clearly ascertained only from the writings of the primitive fathers. What I do ask, therefore, is either a fair and honest interpretation of the above passages in the Roman Catholic sense, and such as Mr. Rourke will declare to be satisfactory to his own mind, or a candid avowal that they teach the Protestant doctrine. I am, Sir, yours, faithfully,

ISAAC ASKE.

Dundalk, August 9, 1856.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR SEPTEMBER.

Stacking.—When the corn is fit to be carried, make the stacks with a long shank and short head; attend to ventilation by carrying up one or more perpendicular chimneys, according to size, as formerly directed, to discharge in a horizontal flue, placed so as to open at each end under the eavings; after the completion of the stack or rick, no time should be lost till it is thatched, lest rain come on.

Ploughing stubble land should be proceeded with as soon as the corn is cut and stooked: no other work should be allowed to interfere with this operation. Turning down the stubble and weeds at an early period promotes their quick decomposition, and prevents that luxuriant autumnal growth of weeds which is sure to follow where it is neglected; besides the paramount advantage of performing the operation while the land is dry. It is not necessary to delay this work till the corn is carried, as the stocks may be made in rows at wide intervals, so that the ploughing may be proceeded with, and the ridges occupied by the stocks or field stacks, as the case may be, ploughed afterwards.

Subsoiling—When necessary, should be executed this month or early next month, before much rain falls to saturate it; when the subsoil is wet, and the temperature falling, it is both slavish and destructive to the health of the men; besides, the benefit to the land is not by any means to be compared to that derived from operating on it while in a state neither too wet nor too dry, and the work is done more economically and satisfactorily.

Winter Vetches, mixed with Rye or Oats, should be sown early in the month, in proportion sufficient to the expected demand. That sown mixed with rye will come into use early, as it should be consumed before the rye shoots out its ear; that mixed with oats lasting longer, and is good at any time. To have a full paying crop, the land should be liberally manured. In very dry ground the land may be ploughed flat, and the seed sown broadcast and harrowed in; but in the generality of land, the safest mode is to plough into eight or ten feet wide ridges, harrowing in the seed and scouring up the furrows with the shovel, by which means a dry bed is secured at all times.

Clovers and Grass Seeds, for permanent pasture or meadow, when not sown last spring, should be got in now without delay.

Fallow lands, where still in favour, should get the seed furrow, and be sown before the end of the month, but this depends on the state of the land, whether it be moist enough. If still dry and crumbling, the sowing should be put off till more rain has fallen.

Pigs for bacon, and porkers, should now be put up to fatten.

Horses will now be at hard work again, and should receive their full allowance of oats, with a few cut carrots, and chaffed hay and clover. Ground beans may be substituted for part of the oats.—*Farmers' Gazette*.

^f Tert. adv. Marcion. 1.5. 4, c. 40, p. 449 edit. 1609.

^g Chrysost. Op. Bened. edit. Paris, vol. 3, 744.